

II. ARGUMENT

A. The Scope of Discovery Is Broad

The scope of discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) is “very broad.” *Cabana v. Forcier*, 200 F.R.D. 9, 17 (D. Mass. 2001). Under the liberal standard set forth in Rule 26(b)(1), “[I]nformation is discoverable if there is any possibility it might be relevant to the subject matter of the motion.” *Id.* at 17, citing *EEOC v. Electro-Term, Inc.*, 167 F.R.D. 344, 346 (D. Mass. 1996). *See also Schuurman v. The Town of North Reading*, 139 F.R.D. 276 (D. Mass. 1991) (Bowler J.); *Sacramona v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.*, 152 F.R.D. 428 (D. Mass. 1993) (Bowler J.); *Gagne v. Reddy*, 104 F.R.D. 454, 456 (D. Mass. 1984). This liberal standard when applied to the requests at issue is easily satisfied.

B. The Information Is Relevant

The ASPs (and information about the processes by which defendants compile them) directly impact issues that go to the core of the class certification and liability issues in this case. The following are only several examples.

In a telling document, defendant Johnson & Johnson concedes that AWP is “reported by manufacturers and subject to manipulation.”¹ In the same document, Johnson & Johnson defines ASP and notes that ASP is “the most transparent price.” This transparency is due to the fact that the ASP calculation must take into account volume discounts, prompt payment discounts, cash discounts, free goods, chargebacks and rebates. As set forth in the allegations of the AMCC these items were typically improperly excluded from defendants’ reported AWP’s. Thus, the newly reported ASPs will provide a guideline as to the current spread and how it was calculated, will allow plaintiffs insight into how to calculate the ASPs for prior years.

An examination of each request demonstrates each is carefully tailored to elicit discoverable information.

¹ Exhibit B, MDL CEN 00008506.

Request No. 1 seeks the actual reported ASPs. As noted, this will allow plaintiffs to calculate current spreads which is relevant in order to show the magnitude of past spreads, the current damages and injunctive relief.

Request No. 2 seeks documents concerning the Interim Regulations. Defendants through their trade association opposed changing from an AWP based reimbursement system to an ASP system. Internal notes as to how the new ASP based system might expose the inflation of AWP, or how a change in spreads resulting from this new reporting might impact market share are likely to exist and would be highly relevant.

Request No. 3 is also likely to elicit admissions concerning the allegations of prior AWP abuse as well as concealment.

Given the gravamen of this action, i.e., illegal spread between published AWP and the actual sales prices, as well as the broad discovery standard, there is little question of the relevancy of the ASPs for each drug. This information is in effect a proxy for what the AWP would have been but for the scheme to report inflated AWP. The fact that it is current does not diminish its relevancy as plaintiffs allege a continuing wrong and course of conduct. Further, the fact that it is current does not diminish the fact that it will provide a benchmark from which plaintiffs and their experts can ascertain whether calculations of previous ASPs are correct. In addition, testimony regarding how defendants calculated the ASPs – including details concerning all of the sources of financial data that were mined – will assist plaintiffs with the task of determining ASPs for prior periods.

III. CONCLUSION

The information sought is narrowly focused, highly relevant and not burdensome. The motion to compel should be granted.

DATED: July 1, 2004

By /s/ Steve W. Berman

Thomas M. Sobol (BBO#471770)
Edward Notargiacomo (BBO#567636)
Hagens Berman LLP
225 Franklin Street, 26th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 482-3700
Facsimile: (617) 482-3003
LIAISON COUNSEL

Steve W. Berman
Sean R. Matt
Hagens Berman LLP
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-7292
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594

Eugene A. Spector
Jeffrey Kodroff
Spector, Roseman & Kodroff, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 496-0300
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611
**CHAIRS OF LEAD COUNSEL
COMMITTEE**

Samuel Heins
Heins, Mills & Olson, P.C.
3550 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 338-4605
Facsimile: (612) 338-4692

Marc H. Edelson
Hoffman & Edelson
45 West Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone: (215) 230-8043
Facsimile: (215) 230-8735

Kenneth A. Wexler
Elizabeth A. Fegan
The Wexler Firm
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 346-2222
Facsimile: (312) 346-0022
**MEMBERS OF LEAD COUNSEL
COMMITTEE AND EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Steve W. Berman, an attorney, caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL HHS ASP DOCUMENTS** to be delivered to all counsel of record by electronic service pursuant to Paragraph 11 of the Case Management Order No. 2, by sending on July 1, 2004, a copy to Verilaw Technologies for Posting and notification to all parties

By /s/ Steve W. Berman

Steve W. Berman

HAGENS BERMAN LLP

1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900

Seattle, WA 98101

(206) 623-7292